

278  
MAR 31 35 PM

# Southern Economic Journal

---

Volume I

FEBRUARY, 1935

Number 4

---

*IN THIS ISSUE—*

The Urban Development  
of the South

By WALTER J. MATHERLY  
*University of Florida*

Book Review

*Economic Planning and the Tariff*

By JAMES G. SMITH [J. R. HUBER]

---

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE SOUTHERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION  
EDITORIAL OFFICE: 11 COMMERCE-JOURNALISM BUILDING  
ATHENS                      GEORGIA

## BOOK REVIEW

*Economic Planning and the Tariff.* By JAMES G. SMITH.

(Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1934, pp. 314. \$3.00.)

In this volume Professor Smith offers a novel approach to the tariff problem. Indeed, the book is a general treatise on the nature of economic planning and its social and economic limits. It is pertinent to observe that the term economic planning has not yet been thoroughly digested by recent economic literature, and Professor Smith attempts to give it precise meaning. The method of presentation is both historical and analytical. The author takes the position that the tariff offers an instance of economic planning, and in this setting the tariff appears as a 'public enemy' of the first magnitude. The fallacies of the tariff are exposed in clear-cut and readable style as an example of how economic planning has operated in the past with deleterious results for everyone except the special interests that have succeeded in securing and maintaining tariff protection.

It is the author's belief that interferences with the free price mechanism and competitive forces via tariffs, price fixing by private monopolies and governments, perverse credit control and the like are a sufficient explanation of the business cycle. The cycle is characterised as 'a product of human manipulation through governments either as a result of common blundering or as a result of control by special interests' (p. 162). This notion may be referred to as a 'residual' theory of the business cycle; for, arguing from the general equilibrium position, the writer finds no adequate reason to believe that inherent forces in the economic structure tend to induce disequilibrium any more than they tend to approximate an equilibrium. A definite stand is taken for the straightforward adoption and enforcement of measures to insure operation of the free price mechanism under the aegis of what might be called enforced competition. Several excellent factual appendices are included in the volume.

J. R. HUBER

*Emory University*

### BOOKS RECEIVED

*The Retirement of Public Employees in Virginia.* By ROWLAND ANDREWS EGGER.

*State Grants-in-Aid in Virginia.* By TIPTON RAY SNAVELY, DUNCAN CLARK HYDE, and ALVIN BLOCKFOM BISCOE.

*Low-Cost Housing and Slum Clearance.* By EDITH ELMER WOOD and others.

*Some Phases of Labor Relations in Virginia.* By GEORGE TALMADGE STARNES, and JOHN E. HAMM.

*Capital and Interest.* By MONTGOMERY D. ANDERSON.

*Basic Economics.* By J. G. EVANS.

by Walter J. Matherly

## THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOUTH

The South in recent decades has experienced a rapid growth in urban population.<sup>1</sup> The facts are evident in Table 1. Two points, however, may be particularly noted: first, of the six regions, the Far West and the Southwest showed the most rapid gains in the urbanization of their populations from 1900 to 1910, and the Southwest and the Southeast from 1920 to 1930;

---

<sup>1</sup> The South, as I conceive it, is composed of two of six major regions into which the United States may be divided. These two regions are the Southeast and the Southwest. The Southeast coincides approximately with the 'Old South,' and comprises 11 states: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia. The Southwest represents a new cultural region long differentiated from "The South" and nearer West than South. It consists of four states: Arizona, Oklahoma, New Mexico and Texas. While these two regions differ from each other in many respects, and while they are really two major regions rather than one, they are sufficiently unlike other regions to warrant their designation as 'the South.'

As Howard W. Odum has pointed out, 'it has for some time been clear that the South not only differs from the rest of the country, but also, and radically, within its own former bounds. There is no longer "the South" but many Souths.' By many Souths he means the various sub-regions of the South. But in spite of these sub-regions, it is possible 'to analyze the South effectively through two major regions and to note in addition to these the border fringe of other states and areas, which either already tend to merge into other regions or appear to be in the process of doing so.' Odum further says: 'It must be clear that Speaker Garner's home region in which his election leading to the vice-presidency was brought about by the votes of hordes of Mexicans is a different South from the Virginia of Carter Glass or from a black belt in Alabama, Georgia, or Mississippi, and that the climate, hydrology, soil, and minerals of Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, and parts of Texas make a poor fist at being "the South." It is also clear that in the border fringe such states as Missouri, West Virginia, and Maryland are not "southern." Although parts of Kentucky and Virginia merge well into the Middle States and Northeast, and certain cultural extensions of the Northeastern States into the Southeast reflect possibilities of ultimate development into a group of "eastern" states, comparable to some extent to the Far Western group, for the present the great majority of indices make quite clear the twofold major divisions of the South as Southeast and Southwest, the Southwest appearing quite as distinctive in both economic and cultural character as are the other major regions of the nation.' Howard W. Odum, 'Regionalism vs. Sectionalism in the South's Place in National Economy,' *Social Forces*, Vol. XII, 3, March, 1934, p. 345.

The other four major regions of the United States with which the South in its urban development may be compared are as follows: the Northeast, the Middle States, the Northwest and the Far West. The Northeast is composed of the District of Columbia and the 12 states of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont and West Virginia. The Middle States consist largely of what was long known as the Middle West and include the eight states of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio and Wisconsin. The Northwest represents the nine states of Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming. The Far West comprises the four states of California, Nevada, Oregon and Washington.

Urban areas, as defined originally by the Bureau of the Census, 'are cities and other incorporated places having 2,500 or more inhabitants.' This definition in the 1930 Census was 'slightly modified so as to include townships and

TABLE 1—URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES, BY REGIONS, 1900, 1910, 1920, AND 1930

REGION	1930 <sup>1</sup>	1920 <sup>1</sup>	1910 <sup>2</sup>	1900 <sup>2</sup>
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>				
Urban.....	7,616,831	5,454,892	4,050,991	2,760,603
Rural.....	17,934,067	17,405,464	16,734,786	15,313,526
Total.....	25,550,898	22,860,356	20,786,777	18,074,129
Per Cent Urban.....	29.8	23.9	19.5	15.3
<b>SOUTHWEST</b>				
Urban.....	3,467,701	2,234,656	1,368,090	626,052
Rural.....	5,611,944	5,151,367	4,717,262	3,531,290
Total.....	9,079,645	7,386,023	6,085,352	4,157,342
Per Cent Urban.....	38.2	30.2	22.5	15.0
<b>FAR WEST</b>				
Urban.....	5,569,345	3,486,737	2,395,696	1,129,551
Rural.....	2,716,146	2,157,541	1,878,483	1,329,476
Total.....	8,285,491	5,644,278	4,274,179	2,459,027
Per Cent Urban.....	67.2	61.8	56.0	45.9
<b>NORTHWEST</b>				
Urban.....	2,626,940	2,230,620	1,768,864	1,135,246
Rural.....	4,757,557	4,682,610	4,295,230	3,436,346
Total.....	7,384,497	6,913,230	6,064,094	4,571,592
Per Cent Urban.....	35.6	32.2	29.2	24.8
<b>MIDDLE STATES</b>				
Urban.....	20,890,935	16,563,263	12,546,436	9,518,565
Rural.....	13,070,509	13,107,481	13,297,999	13,556,928
Total.....	33,961,444	29,670,744	25,844,435	23,075,493
Per Cent Urban.....	61.5	55.8	48.5	41.2
<b>NORTHEAST</b>				
Urban.....	28,773,071	24,334,435	20,493,306	15,627,168
Rural.....	9,730,000	8,901,554	8,425,123	8,029,824
Total.....	38,503,071	33,235,989	28,918,429	23,656,992
Per Cent Urban.....	74.7	73.2	70.8	66.0
<b>UNITED STATES</b>				
Urban.....	68,954,823	54,304,603	42,623,383	30,797,185
Rural.....	55,820,223	51,406,017	49,348,883	45,197,390
Total.....	122,775,046	105,710,620	91,272,266	75,994,575
Per Cent Urban.....	56.2	51.4	46.7	40.0

<sup>1</sup> United States Census, 1930, *Population*, Vol. I; compiled from Table 9, p. 15.<sup>2</sup> United States Census, 1910, *Population*, Vol. I, compiled from Table 36, pp.56-57.

second, neither the Southeast nor the Southwest is as urbanized as the United States, the Northeast, or the Middle States. As compared with the Northeast, the Middle States, the Far West, or the United States as a whole, both the Southeast and the

other political divisions (not incorporated as municipalities, nor containing any areas so incorporated) which had a population of 10,000 or more and a population density of 1,000 or more per square mile.' The change of definition added to the urban group 28 places, with an aggregate population of 573,329, 'which would have been classified as rural under the rules governing the Urban-rural classification in 1920.' United States Census, 1930, *Population*, Vol. I, p. 7.

Southwest in spite of rapid urban gains are still rural to a marked degree.

The urban population of the Southwest during the past 30 years has increased more rapidly than the urban population of the United States or of any of the other regions except the Far West. Likewise, the urban population of the Southeast

TABLE 2—PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE IN URBAN AND RURAL POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES BY REGIONS, 1900 TO 1930

REGION	URBAN	RURAL	TOTAL
UNITED STATES	123.9	19.1	61.5
Southeast	175.9	17.1	41.3
Southwest	453.9	58.9	118.4
Far West	393.0	104.3	236.9
Northwest	131.4	38.4	61.5
Middle States	119.4	3.5 <sup>1</sup>	47.1
Northeast	84.1	21.1	62.7

<sup>1</sup> Decrease.

has increased more rapidly than the urban population of the United States or of any of the other regions. That these statements are true may be observed from Table 2. Whereas the urban population of the United States increased 123.9 per cent from 1900 to 1930, the urban population of the Southeast increased 175.9 per cent, and the urban population of the Southwest increased 453.9 per cent. In percentage of increase in urban population during the three decades, the Southwest ranked first, the Far West second, and the Southeast third. The Northeast, which is the most highly urbanized region of the entire United States, and which has probably 'attained an equilibrium in the urban-rural ratios of its population,' stood last; it increased only 84.1 per cent.

The Middle States experienced a decrease of 3.5 per cent in rural population from 1900 to 1930. Of the five remaining regions, the Southeast showed the smallest percentage of increase in rural population, even a smaller percentage increase than the United States. The Southwest, however, had a larger percentage of increase than any other region except the Far West. While the Southeast had a smaller percentage of increase in total population from 1900 to 1930 than any other region, both the Southeast and the Southwest are rapidly shifting—the latter shifting more rapidly than the former—from

rural to urban modes of living. Neither region is nearing any such urban maturity as characterizes the Northeast or the Middle States, but both are moving speedily from rural to urban economies.

## II

The growth in the number of cities in the South during the

TABLE 3—NUMBER OF CITIES AND PLACES OF SPECIFIED SIZES IN THE UNITED STATES BY REGIONS, 1900 AND 1930

REGION AND YEAR	TOTAL NUMBER	CITIES OF 100,000 OR MORE	PLACES OF 25,000 TO 100,000	PLACES OF 10,000 TO 25,000	PLACES OF 5,000 TO 10,000	PLACES OF 2,500 TO 5,000
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>						
1900 <sup>1</sup>	253	3	17	34 <sup>3</sup>	51 <sup>3</sup>	148
1930 <sup>2</sup>	565	13	41 <sup>4</sup>	86 <sup>4</sup>	137	288
Per cent of increase	123.3	333.3	141.2	152.9	168.8	94.6
<b>SOUTHWEST</b>						
1900 <sup>1</sup>	80	0	5	9	20	46
1930 <sup>2</sup>	257	7	16	34	79	121
Per cent of increase	221.3	—	220.0	277.8	295.0	163.0
<b>FAR WEST</b>						
1900 <sup>1</sup>	68	2	6	7	13	40
1930 <sup>2</sup>	227	10	19	43	62	93
Per cent of increase	233.8	400.0	216.7	514.3	376.9	132.5
<b>NORTHWEST</b>						
1900 <sup>1</sup>	121	2	7	15	27	70
1930 <sup>2</sup>	220	5	10	44	57	104 <sup>4</sup>
Per cent of increase	81.8	150.0	42.9	193.3	111.1	48.6
<b>MIDDLE STATES</b>						
1900 <sup>1</sup>	609	13	31	93	169	303
1930 <sup>2</sup>	884	25	91	153	239	376
Per cent of increase	45.2	92.3	193.5	64.5	41.4	19.4
<b>NORTHEAST</b>						
1900 <sup>1</sup>	763	18	57	128	197	363
1930 <sup>2</sup>	1,015	33	107	247	277	351
Per cent of increase	33.2	94.1	87.7	93.0	40.6	3.3 <sup>5</sup>
<b>UNITED STATES</b>						
1900 <sup>1</sup>	1,891 <sup>6</sup>	38	123	285 <sup>6</sup>	476 <sup>6</sup>	969
1930 <sup>2</sup>	3,165 <sup>6</sup>	93	283 <sup>6</sup>	606 <sup>6</sup>	851	1,332
Per cent of increase	67.4	144.7	130.1	112.6	112.6	37.5

<sup>1</sup> United States Census, 1910, *Population*, Vol. I; compiled from the Table 46, pp. 67-70.

<sup>2</sup> United States Census, 1930, *Population*, Vol. I; compiled from Table 10, pp. 16-17.

<sup>3</sup> Includes one place also counted in the Southwest.

<sup>4</sup> Includes two places also counted in the Southwest.

<sup>5</sup> Decrease. <sup>6</sup> The total is less than the sum of the regions because certain places which lie on the border between the Southeast and the Southwest were counted in both regions.

past three decades has also been rapid. Table 3 shows by regions the number of cities and places of 2,500 or more inhabitants in the United States in 1900 and 1930. The percentage of increase in the number of cities of each of the specified sizes, as this table reveals, is greater in both the Southeast and the Southwest than in any of the other regions except the Far West. The leadership of the South, always excepting the Far West, is most notable in cities of 100,000 population or more. With the same exception, the statement is likewise true of places in the 25,000-100,000, 10,000-25,000, and 2,500-5,000 brackets. In the case of towns in the 2,500-5,000 class, the regional rank was slightly altered, for the Southwest ranked first, the Far West second, and the Southeast third. In the Northeast, the number of cities of this size actually decreased 3.3 per cent.

From Table 4, it may be observed that the Southeast and

TABLE 4—NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF URBAN INHABITANTS IN CITIES AND PLACES OF SPECIFIED SIZES IN THE UNITED STATES, BY REGIONS, 1930<sup>1</sup>

REGION	CITIES OF 100,000 OR MORE	PLACES OF 25,000 TO 100,000	PLACES OF 10,000 TO 25,000	PLACES OF 5,000 TO 10,000	PLACES OF 2,500 TO 5,000	TOTAL URBAN POPULATION
SOUTHEAST						
Number	2,583,146	1,878,915	1,242,275	916,762	995,733	7,616,831
Per cent of total	33.9	24.7	16.3	12.0	13.1	100.0
SOUTHWEST						
Number	1,376,884	622,250	483,641	546,710	438,216	3,467,701
Per cent of total	39.7	17.9	13.9	15.8	9.3	99.9
FAR WEST						
Number	3,336,261	852,255	627,041	436,780	316,998	5,569,345
Per cent of total	59.9	15.3	11.3	7.8	5.7	100.0
NORTHWEST						
Number	875,101	421,078	597,266	384,157	349,338	2,626,940
Per cent of total	33.3	16.0	22.7	14.6	13.3	99.9
MIDDLE STATES						
Number	11,604,868	4,011,910	2,280,953	1,651,138	1,342,066	20,890,935
Per cent of total	55.5	19.2	10.9	7.9	6.4	99.9
NORTHEAST						
Number	16,549,476	5,130,723	3,866,024	1,961,609	1,275,239	28,783,071
Per cent of total	57.5	17.8	13.4	6.8	4.4	99.9
UNITED STATES						
Number	36,325,736	12,917,141	9,097,200	5,897,156	4,717,590	68,954,823
Per cent of total	52.7	18.7	13.2	8.6	6.8	100.0

<sup>1</sup> United States Census, 1930, *Population*, Vol. I; compiled from Table 10, pp. 16-17.

Southwest, along with the Northwest, are notable in having a lesser concentration of population in cities of 100,000 and above than is true of other regions. In the Southeast places of 25,000 to 100,000 are relatively more significant as centers of urban population than in other sections; and places of 10,000 to 25,000 are relatively more important than in other regions ex-

TABLE 5—PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL URBAN POPULATION IN CITIES AND PLACES OF SPECIFIED SIZES IN THE UNITED STATES, BY REGIONS, 1930<sup>1</sup>

REGION	CITIES OF 100,000 OR MORE	PLACES OF 25,000 TO 100,000	PLACES OF 10,000 TO 25,000	PLACES OF 5,000 TO 10,000	PLACES OF 2,500 TO 5,000	TOTAL URBAN POP- ULATION
SOUTHEAST.....	7.1	14.5	13.7	15.5	21.1	11.0
SOUTHWEST.....	3.8	4.8	5.3	9.3	9.3	5.0
FAR WEST.....	9.2	6.6	6.9	7.4	6.7	8.1
NORTHWEST.....	2.4	3.3	6.6	6.5	4.4	3.8
MIDDLE STATES.....	31.9	31.1	25.1	28.0	28.4	30.3
NORTHEAST.....	45.6	39.7	42.4	33.3	27.0	41.8
UNITED STATES.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.0

<sup>1</sup> This table is derived from Table 4.

cept the Northwest. As would reasonably be expected, the Southeast and the Southwest, which are more largely rural than other regions, like the Northwest, which is also more largely rural, have greater relative proportions of their urban populations concentrated in places of smaller sizes, whereas the other regions have their urban populations concentrated in cities of larger sizes, especially cities of 100,000 or more.

Tables 5 and 6 show supplemental information. The former

TABLE 6—PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL REGIONAL POPULATIONS IN CITIES AND PLACES OF SPECIFIED SIZES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1930<sup>1</sup>

REGIONS	IN CITIES OF 100,000 OR MORE	IN PLACES OF 25,000 TO 100,000	IN PLACES OF 10,000 TO 25,000	IN PLACES OF 5,000 TO 10,000	IN PLACES OF 2,500 TO 5,000	IN ALL CITIES AND PLACES OF 2,500 OR MORE
SOUTHEAST.....	10.1	7.4	4.9	3.6	3.9	29.8
SOUTHWEST.....	15.2	6.9	5.3	6.0	4.8	38.2
FAR WEST.....	40.3	10.3	7.6	5.3	3.8	67.2
NORTHWEST.....	11.9	5.7	8.1	5.2	4.7	35.6
MIDDLE STATES.....	34.2	11.8	6.7	4.9	4.0	61.5
NORTHEAST.....	43.0	13.3	10.0	5.1	3.3	74.7
UNITED STATES.....	29.6	10.5	7.4	4.8	3.8	56.2

<sup>1</sup> This table is derived from Tables 1 and 4.



details the regional percentage distribution, for towns and cities of various sizes, of the total urban population in the United States; and the latter presents data concerning the percentage distribution, for the several classes of towns and cities, of the total population in each region.

## III

Neither the Southeast nor the Southwest has ever developed great metropolises. Table 7 gives for the two regions the names and population of cities that had 100,000 inhabitants or more in 1930. It will be observed from this table that there were 13 of these cities in the Southeast and seven in the Southwest, and that in 1900 there were only three cities in the Southeast with 100,000 inhabitants or more and none in the Southwest. Some of the Southern cities have shown a remarkable growth. For instance, Miami, Florida, in the year 1900 had only 1,681. Even in 1910 it had only 5,471. In 1900 Tulsa, Oklahoma,

TABLE 7—POPULATION OF CITIES IN THE SOUTH HAVING, IN 1930, 100,000 INHABITANTS OR MORE, 1900 TO 1930<sup>1</sup>

REGION	1930	1920	1910	1900
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	<b>2,583,146</b>	<b>1,878,119</b>	<b>1,468,978</b>	<b>1,043,721</b>
New Orleans	458,762	387,219	339,075	287,104
Louisville	307,745	234,891	223,928	204,731
Atlanta	270,366	200,616	154,839	89,872
Birmingham	259,678	178,806	132,685	38,415
Memphis	253,143	162,351	131,105	102,320
Richmond	182,929	171,667	127,628	85,050
Nashville	153,866	118,342	110,364	80,865
Norfolk	129,710	115,777	67,452	46,624
Jacksonville	129,549	91,558	57,699	28,429
Chattanooga	119,798	57,895	44,604	30,154
Miami	110,637	29,571	5,471	1,681
Knoxville	105,802	77,818	36,346	32,637
Tampa	101,161	51,608	37,782	15,839
<b>SOUTHWEST</b>	<b>1,376,884</b>	<b>806,043</b>	<b>462,489</b>	<b>194,613</b>
Houston	292,352	138,276	78,800	44,633
Dallas	260,475	158,976	92,104	42,638
San Antonio	231,542	161,379	96,614	53,321
Oklahoma City	185,389	91,295	64,205	10,037
Fort Worth	163,447	106,482	73,312	26,688
Tulsa	141,258	72,075	18,182	1,390
El Paso	102,421	77,560	39,272	15,906

<sup>1</sup> United States Census, 1930, Vol. I, *Population*; compiled from Table 11, pp. 18-20.

had only 1,390 people and even in 1910 it had only 18,182 people.

The South has but one city that ranks among the 20 largest cities in the United States. In 1930 New Orleans stood sixteenth among the 93 cities of 100,000 or more; Louisville stood twenty-fourth; Houston, twenty-sixth; Atlanta, thirty-second; Dallas, thirty-third; Birmingham, thirty-fourth; Memphis, thirty-sixth; San Antonio, thirty-eighth; Oklahoma City, forty-third; Richmond, forty-fourth; Fort Worth, forty-eighth; Nashville, fifty-first; Tulsa, fifty-eighth; Norfolk, sixty-second; Jacksonville, sixty-third; Chattanooga, sixty-seventh; Miami, seventy-eighth; Knoxville, eighty-first; El Paso, eighty-sixth, and Tampa, ninety-first.

#### IV

The increase of population in places of 2,500 or more does not tell the whole story of the South's urban development, for the examination of the incorporated city alone does not show the true status of urban concentration. Suburbs and contiguous territories must be included. Suburban residents are practically as much a part of the central city near which they live as those residing within its corporate limits. They generally depend upon the central city for their employment, for their social and recreational activities, and for their cultural life and development. Consequently, any study of urban growth must include not only the central political units in urban aggregations but also the suburbs, the satellite cities and the regions of relatively high population density lying far beyond political boundaries.

When we approach urban concentration in this way, we have the metropolitan district. The metropolitan district, as defined by the Bureau of the Census, includes 'in addition to the central city or cities, all adjacent and contiguous civil divisions having a density of 150 inhabitants or more per square mile, and also, as a rule, those civil divisions of less density that are directly contiguous to the central cities, or are entirely or nearly surrounded by minor civil divisions that have the required density'.<sup>1</sup> By using this definition the Bureau of the Census has marked off and made a special study of 96 metropolitan districts in the United States, 'each having an aggregate population of

<sup>1</sup> United States Census, 1930; *Metropolitan Districts*, pp. 5-6.

100,000 or more and containing one or more central cities of 50,000 or more inhabitants.'

Table 8 shows the population in 1920 and in 1930, the land area and the density for metropolitan districts in the Southeast, the Southwest, and the United States in 1930. It will be observed from the table that 54,753,610 people in 1930 resided in the 96 metropolitan districts in the United States; that 3,708,182 resided in the 16 districts in the Southeast; and that 1,606,551 resided in the seven districts in the Southwest.

TABLE 8—POPULATION IN 1920 AND 1930, LAND AREA, AND POPULATION DENSITY FOR METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS IN THE SOUTHEAST, THE SOUTHWEST, AND THE UNITED STATES IN 1930<sup>1</sup>

AREA	POPULATION		PER CENT OF IN- CREASE	1930	
	1930	1920		Land area in square miles	Popula- tion per square mile
UNITED STATES.....	54,753,645	(2)	—	36,577.87	1,496.9
SOUTHEAST.....	3,708,182	1,862,813	—	4,615.97	803.3
Atlanta.....	370,920	260,424	42.4	221.31	1,676.0
Birmingham.....	332,792	266,772	43.5	307.86	1,243.4
Chattanooga.....	168,589	(2)	—	489.72	344.3
Jacksonville.....	148,713	(2)	—	218.06	682.0
Knoxville.....	135,714	95,835	41.6	192.63	704.0
Little Rock.....	113,137	88,454	27.9	108.99	1,038.0
Louisville.....	404,396	330,048	22.5	463.92	871.7
Memphis.....	276,126	(2)	—	221.16	1,248.5
Miami.....	132,189	(2)	—	111.56	1,184.9
Nashville.....	209,422	156,238	34.0	323.36	647.6
New Orleans.....	494,877	(2)	—	287.02	1,724.2
Norfolk-Portsmouth- Newport News.....	273,233	298,086	8.3 <sup>3</sup>	468.59	583.1
Richmond.....	220,513	194,890	13.1	334.60	659.0
Roanoke.....	103,120	72,034	43.2	231.00	446.4
Savannah.....	105,431	100,032	5.4	370.01	284.9
Tampa-St. Petersburg.....	169,010	(2)	—	266.18	634.9
SOUTHWEST.....	1,606,551	814,063	97.3	2,805.56	572.6
Dallas.....	309,658	195,565	58.3	504.42	613.9
El Paso.....	118,461	94,210	25.7	290.32	407.3
Fort Worth.....	174,575	129,744	34.6	170.60	1,023.3
Houston.....	339,216	(2)	—	799.20	424.4
Oklahoma City.....	202,163	100,773	100.6	181.78	1,112.1
San Antonio.....	279,271	189,392	47.5	467.34	597.6
Tulsa.....	183,207	104,379	75.5	391.40	468.1

<sup>1</sup> United States Census, 1930, *Metropolitan Districts*; compiled from Table 4, pp. 10-13.

(2) Comparison of population cannot be made.

<sup>3</sup> Decrease.

Since comparable figures for 11 metropolitan districts in the United States, six in the Southeast and one in the Southwest, are not available for 1920, we cannot calculate the percentages of increase in metropolitan population for each of these three geographical areas. The percentage in 85 metropolitan districts in the United States from 1920 to 1930, however, was 24.9, and we may make use of this figure as a basis of comparison in measuring the growth of particular districts in the Southeast and the Southwest.

The percentage of increase in population from 1920 to 1930 in each of the 10 metropolitan districts in the Southeast for which comparable figures are available was greater than that of the United States, except in case of Louisville, Norfolk-Portsmouth-Newport News, Richmond, and Savannah—all cities on the Atlantic coast. The percentage of increase in each of the six metropolitan districts of the Southwest was, with the exception of El Paso, two to four times greater than that

TABLE 9—TOTAL POPULATION, AND INCREASES BETWEEN 1920 AND 1930, FOR  
10 METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS IN THE SOUTHEAST, 7 IN  
THE SOUTHWEST, AND 85 IN THE UNITED  
STATES<sup>1</sup>

AREA	1930	1920	INCREASE, 1920 TO 1930	
			Number	Per cent
UNITED STATES	122,775,046	105,710,620	17,064,426	16.1
Eighty-five metropolitan districts <sup>2</sup>	50,043,223	40,057,307	9,985,916	24.9
In central cities	34,563,274	28,940,288	5,622,986	19.4
Outside central cities	15,479,949	11,117,019	4,362,930	39.2
Outside metropolitan districts	72,731,823	65,653,313	7,078,510	10.8
SOUTHEAST	25,550,898	22,860,356	2,690,542	11.8
Ten metropolitan districts <sup>2</sup>	2,318,478	1,862,813	455,665	24.5
In central cities	1,725,926	1,387,136	338,790	24.4
Outside central cities	592,552	475,677	116,875	24.6
Outside metropolitan districts	23,232,410	20,997,543	2,234,977	10.6
SOUTHWEST	9,079,645	7,386,023	1,693,622	22.9
Six metropolitan districts <sup>2</sup>	1,267,335	814,063	453,272	55.7
In central cities	1,034,532	668,611	415,921	62.2
Outside central cities	182,803	145,452	37,351	25.7
Outside metropolitan districts	7,812,310	6,571,960	1,240,350	18.9

<sup>1</sup> United States Census, 1930, *Metropolitan Districts*; compiled from Table 4, pp. 10-13.

<sup>2</sup> Comparable figures for all metropolitan districts are not available for both 1920 and 1930.

of the United States. The percentage of increase in Tulsa was 75.5 and in Oklahoma City 100.6. The seven metropolitan districts in the United States having the highest percentages of increase from 1920 to 1930 were in order of rank: Miami, Los Angeles, Oklahoma City, Houston, San Diego, Tampa-St. Petersburg, and Tulsa.<sup>1</sup> Two of the seven are in the Southeast and three are in the Southwest.

With the exception of New Orleans and Atlanta, population per square mile in none of these districts in the Southeast in 1930 was as great as that in the United States. Since the density of population depends in large measure on the land area, population per square mile of course varies widely. It ranges all the way from 284.9 in Savannah to 1,724.2 in New Orleans.

Table 9 shows the total population and increase between 1920 and 1930 for 10 metropolitan districts in the Southeast, 6 in the Southwest, and 85 in the United States. These are the only districts, as has already been pointed out, for which comparable figures are available in both years. While the increase in population in the 85 districts from 1920 to 1930 was 24.9 per cent, the increase in total population of the United States was only 16.1 per cent. The population in central cities of metropolitan districts increased much less rapidly than the population outside central cities, since the former increased

TABLE 10—TOTAL POPULATION AND AREA OF THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICTS IN THE SOUTHEAST, THE SOUTHWEST, AND THE UNITED STATES IN 1930<sup>1</sup>

AREA	POPULATION		AREA		POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE
	Number	Per cent	Square miles	Per cent	
SOUTHEAST	3,708,182	100.0	4,615.97	100.0	803.3
In central cities	2,939,601	79.3	668.55	14.5	4,397.0
Outside central cities	768,581	20.7	3,947.42	85.5	194.7
SOUTHWEST	1,606,551	100.0	2,805.56	100.0	573.2
In central cities	1,376,884	85.7	261.14	9.3	5,272.2
Outside central cities	229,667	14.3	2,544.42	90.7	90.4
UNITED STATES	54,753,645	100.0	36,577.87	100.0	1,496.9
In central cities	37,814,610	69.1	4,596.05	12.3	8,380.4
Outside central cities	16,939,035	30.9	31,981.82	87.7	528.3

<sup>1</sup> United States Census, 1930, *Metropolitan Districts*; compiled from Table 4, pp. 10-13.

<sup>1</sup> R. D. McKenzie, *The Metropolitan Community*, 1933, p. 322.

only 19.4 per cent while the latter increased 39.2 per cent. The population of metropolitan districts increased far more rapidly than population outside metropolitan districts, since the former increased 24.9 per cent and the latter only 10.8 per cent.

Further data on total population and area of metropolitan districts in the Southeast and Southwest as compared with the United States may be found in Table 10.

## V

The urbanization of the South has taken place more rapidly in some states than in others. Table 11 presents the percentages of urban population in the Southeast and the Southwest by states. An examination of this table makes evident the widely differing degrees of urbanization among the various states. As would be expected from preceding tables, it is apparent that the increase in urban population in the states of the Southwest has been even greater in general than that of the states in the Southeast. This circumstance arises in spite of the fact that the number of inhabitants per square mile in the Southwest is very much smaller than in the Southeast. The popula-

TABLE 11.—PERCENTAGE OF URBAN POPULATION IN THE SOUTHEAST AND SOUTHWEST BY STATES: 1900, 1910, 1920, 1930<sup>1</sup>

AREA	1930 <sup>1</sup>	1920 <sup>1</sup>	1910 <sup>2</sup>	1900 <sup>2</sup>
SOUTHEAST	29.4	23.8	19.5	15.3
Alabama	28.1	21.7	17.3	11.9
Arkansas	20.6	16.6	12.9	8.5
Florida	51.7	36.7	29.1	20.3
Georgia	30.8	25.1	20.6	15.6
Kentucky	30.6	26.2	24.3	21.8
Louisiana	39.7	34.9	30.0	26.5
Mississippi	16.9	13.4	11.5	7.7
North Carolina	25.5	19.2	14.4	9.9
South Carolina	21.3	17.5	14.8	12.8
Tennessee	34.3	26.1	20.2	16.2
Virginia	32.4	29.2	23.1	18.3
SOUTHWEST	38.1	30.2	22.5	15.0
Arizona	34.4	35.2	30.9	15.8
New Mexico	25.2	18.0	14.2	14.0
Oklahoma	34.3	26.6	19.3	7.4
Texas	41.0	32.4	24.1	17.1

<sup>1</sup> United States Census, 1930, *Population*, Vol. I; compiled from Table 9, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> United States Census, 1910, *Abstract of the Thirteenth Census of the United States*; compiled from Table 18, p. 56.

tion of the Southwest has tended to concentrate itself in cities to a higher degree than the population of the Southeast.

Of the six states in the United States—Nevada, Florida, Texas, Tennessee, Oklahoma, and New Mexico—exhibiting the most rapid gains in urbanization from 1920 to 1930, two are in the Southeast and three are in the Southwest. Each of these states, except Tennessee, increased in total population during the decade at a rate faster than that of the United States as a whole.<sup>1</sup> Likewise, each of them except Tennessee might be considered frontier states in the spread of settlement. But these states are unlike the frontier states in which the spread of earlier settlements occurred; they present more 'nucleated patterns' or areas of urban concentration than earlier frontiers. 'Even today,' says McKenzie, 'the wheat states in the North, particularly the Dakotas, are much less urbanized than the newer regions of settlement in Oklahoma, western Texas, or any of the Mountain States,' or Florida.<sup>2</sup>

## VI

The racial characteristics of urban population in the South differ materially from those of urban population in other regions. Table 12 presents urban, rural-farm and rural-non-farm population in the various regions by color and nativity.<sup>3</sup> It will be observed from this table that only 29.8 per cent of the total native white population in the Southeast and 37.8 per cent in the Southwest are urban dwellers, whereas 66.9 per cent of the total in the Far West, 58.1 per cent in the Middle States and 71.3 per cent in the Northeast are urban dwellers. Even in the United States as a whole 54.6 per cent of the total native whites live in urban areas. The Northwest only shows a percentage of urban native whites similar to the Southeast and the Southwest. Approximately 70 per cent of native whites in the Southeast and 60 per cent in the Southwest still reside either on the soil or in close proximity to the soil.

Neither the Southeast nor the Southwest has many foreign-

<sup>1</sup> R. D. McKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27.

<sup>3</sup> The Bureau of the Census explains the difference between rural-farm and rural-nonfarm population as follows: 'The rural-farm population includes more than 99 per cent of the total farm population. The rural-nonfarm (or "village") population includes small manufacturing villages and trading centers, unincorporated suburban areas, mining settlements, etc., and a considerable number of families living in the open country but not on farms.' United States Census, 1930, *Abstract of Fifteenth Census of the United States*, p. 5.

TABLE 12—URBAN, RURAL-FARM AND RURAL-NONFARM POPULATION BY COLOR AND NATIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES, ARRANGED BY REGIONS: 1930 1

Regions	ALL CLASSES			NATIVE WHITE		WHITE FOREIGN-BORN		NEGRO		OTHER RACES	
	Number (in thou- sands)	Per cent of total	Number (in thou- sands)	Per cent of total	Number (in thou- sands)	Per cent of total	Number (in thou- sands)	Per cent of total	Number (in thou- sands)	Per cent of total	
SOUTHEAST											
Urban	25,551	100.0	17,526	99.9	213	100.0	7,778	100.0	33	100.0	
Rural-farm	7,617	29.8	5,228	29.8	154	72.1	2,231	28.7	4	12.6	
Rural-nonfarm	12,177	47.7	8,067	46.0	23	10.8	4,064	52.2	23	69.7	
	5,757	22.5	4,231	24.1	36	17.1	1,483	19.1	6	17.7	
SOUTHWEST											
Urban	9,079	100.0	6,855	100.0	149	100.0	1,041	100.0	1,035	100.0	
Rural-farm	3,468	38.2	2,593	37.8	78	52.5	404	38.9	392	37.9	
Rural-nonfarm	3,620	39.9	2,707	39.5	42	28.3	491	47.2	380	36.7	
	1,991	21.9	1,555	22.7	29	19.2	145	13.9	263	25.4	
	8,285	100.0	6,407	100.0	1,172	100.0	90	100.0	615	100.0	
FAR WEST											
Urban	5,569	67.2	4,286	66.9	836	71.3	78	86.7	370	60.1	
Rural-farm	1,117	13.5	852	13.3	153	13.0	4	4.2	109	17.6	
Rural-nonfarm	1,599	19.3	1,269	19.8	183	15.7	8	9.1	137	22.3	
	7,385	100.0	6,505	100.0	608	100.0	97	100.0	174	100.0	
NORTHWEST											
Urban	2,627	35.6	2,285	35.1	219	36.0	79	81.0	44	25.2	
Rural-farm	2,925	39.6	2,621	40.3	230	37.8	5	5.6	68	39.2	
Rural-nonfarm	1,833	24.8	1,599	24.6	159	26.2	13	13.4	62	35.6	
	33,962	100.0	28,737	100.0	3,927	100.0	1,181	100.0	117	100.0	
MIDDLE STATES											
Urban	20,891	61.5	16,700	58.1	3,069	78.2	1,043	88.3	78	67.3	
Rural-farm	7,415	21.8	6,916	24.1	441	11.2	49	4.1	10	8.2	
Rural-nonfarm	5,656	16.7	5,121	17.8	417	10.6	90	7.6	9	24.5	
	38,513	99.9	29,468	100.0	7,297	100.0	1,703	100.0	45	99.9	
NORTHEAST											
Urban	28,783	74.7	21,018	71.3	6,371	87.3	1,358	79.8	36	79.7	
Rural-farm	2,903	7.5	2,638	9.0	195	2.7	67	3.9	2	5.1	
Rural-nonfarm	6,827	17.7	5,812	19.7	731	10.0	277	16.3	7	15.1	
	122,775	100.0	95,498	100.0	13,366	100.0	11,891	100.0	2,019	100.0	
UNITED STATES											
Urban	68,955	56.2	52,110	54.6	10,727	80.3	5,194	43.7	923	45.8	
Rural-farm	30,157	24.5	23,801	24.9	1,084	8.1	4,680	39.4	592	29.3	
Rural-nonfarm	23,663	19.3	19,587	20.5	1,555	11.6	2,017	16.9	504	24.9	



born whites. The total in the former in 1930 was only 213,000 of which 72.1 per cent were urban, and in the latter only 147,000 of which 52.5 per cent were urban. Foreign-born whites in these regions are concentrated in cities just as they are concentrated in cities in all of the other regions except the Northwest, but they are not concentrated to quite so high a degree. Save perhaps in cities like Tampa, New Orleans, and Houston, cities in the South have never had large foreign elements in their populations; neither have they encountered the problems incident to foreign quarters or colonies.

The most striking difference between the urban population of the South and that of other regions is the Negro. Further study of Table 12 will show that whereas Negroes in the other regions reside almost altogether in cities, in the Southeast and the Southwest they reside largely in rural territory.

While the cities of the South have never attracted the bulk of Negro population, nevertheless, they have attracted Negroes in considerable numbers. Table 13 shows the percentage of urban population by color and nativity in the United States in 1930 arranged by regions.

TABLE 13—PERCENTAGE OF URBAN POPULATION BY COLOR AND NATIVITY IN THE UNITED STATES ARRANGED BY REGIONS, 1930<sup>1</sup>

REGIONS	ALL CLASSES	NATIVE WHITE	FOREIGN-BORN WHITE	NEGRO	OTHER RACES
SOUTHEAST	99.9	68.6	.8	30.4	.1
SOUTHWEST	100.0	74.8	2.2	11.7	11.3
FAR WEST	100.0	77.0	15.0	1.4	6.6
NORTHWEST	100.0	87.0	8.3	3.0	1.7
MIDDLE STATES	100.0	79.9	14.7	5.0	.4
NORTHEAST	99.9	73.0	22.1	4.7	.1
UNITED STATES	100.0	75.6	15.6	7.5	1.3

<sup>1</sup> Derived from Table 12.

## VII

The urbanization of the South is the product of many forces, some economic and some non-economic. The urban development of the Old South began shortly after the Civil War. During the period of reconstruction everything south of the Potomac was upset and in a state of confusion. Carpetbaggers as well as irresponsible Negroes roamed the countryside as well as preyed

upon people in the cities. Those who resided on isolated farms lived in constant dread. Consequently, large numbers shifted from rural to urban neighborhoods primarily for purposes of safety and security. Nearly every place of any importance in the South between 1865 and 1875 doubled its size.<sup>1</sup> Those who moved to urban communities still owned land and were chiefly concerned with tilling the soil; but when their sons began to grow up they turned to the professions or to commerce and business rather than to agriculture. This enabled the cities to retain the population which they had accumulated and to lay the foundations for later progress. Thus the process of urbanization began in the South.

The growth of Southern cities both in number and in size has continued since the days of reconstruction with constantly increasing acceleration. 'The activities required to sustain any society,' whether in the South or elsewhere in the modern world, involve, as McKenzie observes, 'a territorial division of labor of a twofold nature: (1) the field work at the sources from which the basic materials are procured from nature; and (2) the center work where the raw materials are processed for consumption and where group services are performed. As a civilization grows in wealth and complexity, the number and variety of both field and center activities increase correspondingly. Two general tendencies are observable with regard to the spatial aspects of the production of goods and services: (1) the proportion of labor required to obtain the original materials from nature is becoming relatively less than that required to fabricate them and to effect the various services demanded by a population with a rising standard of living; and (2) modern communications have so shrunk space that these center activities may be performed over wider areas than formerly, thereby concentrating territorially these functions and the populations engaged in their performance.'<sup>2</sup> These tendencies, so admirably stated by McKenzie, are as applicable to the South as to other regions, and out of them arises the principal impetus to Southern urban progress.

The rise of manufacturing is one of the chief causes of urban development in the South. This is especially true in the earlier periods of urban history, since in these periods the increase in

<sup>1</sup> Edd Winfield Parks, 'Southern Towns and Cities,' Chapter 23 in *Culture in the South*, Edited by W. T. Couch, 1933, p. 502.

<sup>2</sup> R. D. McKenzie, *op. cit.*, pp. 50-51.

the number of factory wage earners, as may be seen from Table 14, bore a fairly constant relation to the increase in urban population.<sup>1</sup>

The growth in urban population and in number of factory wage earners in the United States is relatively the same in the earlier decades as that in the Southeast and Southwest. But during the past decade, as Table 14 further shows, urban population in the United States increased 26.9 per cent, whereas the number of wage earners actually decreased 2.1 per cent. The rise of manufacturing industries, therefore, at least in so far as the number of wage earners is concerned, does not account, particularly in the last decade, for the continued concentration of population in either the United States as a whole or in the Southeast and Southwest.<sup>2</sup>

The number of wage earners in manufacturing industries in the South has never constituted a very high proportion of the total population. Table 15 presents figures in support of this statement. As may readily be observed, the ratio of wage earners to urban population in the Southeast and the South-

TABLE 14—PERCENTAGE OF INCREASE IN URBAN POPULATION AND FACTORY WAGE EARNERS IN THE SOUTHEAST, THE SOUTHWEST, AND THE UNITED STATES BY DECADES<sup>1</sup>

DECADE	SOUTHEAST	SOUTHWEST	UNITED STATES
URBAN POPULATION			
1900 to 1910	46.8	118.5	38.0
1910 to 1920	34.6	63.5	27.4
1920 to 1930	39.6	68.6	26.9
WAGE EARNERS			
1899 to 1909	52.5	100.0	40.4
1909 to 1919	22.1	60.6	36.1
1919 to 1929	12.9	17.9	2.1 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This table is derived from Table 15.

<sup>2</sup> Decrease.

<sup>1</sup> The method of analyzing the causes of urban concentration in the South used by the author follows in general that which McKenzie uses in analyzing the causes of urban concentration in the Nation. See R. D. McKenzie, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-65.

<sup>2</sup> In spite of a declining industrial wage earning population in the Southeast and Southwest as well as in the United States, the output in each has continued to increase, as examination of the figures on value of products, value added by manufacture and horse power used in 1929 as compared with 1919 will indicate. 'It is quite apparent,' concludes McKenzie, 'that technological advance is having the same effect in manufacturing industries as in agriculture and the other basic industries. The machine and mechanical energy are reducing the amount of labor required to operate our factories just as they are reducing the number of persons required to cultivate our fields and procure our minerals.' R. D. McKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

west as well as in the United States is notably lower in 1929 than in any of the preceding years.

Manufacturing in the United States is still highly concentrated in the Northeast and the Middle States; but there is appreciable evidence that a process of decentralization has set in during the past decade or so. Interregional shifts from the

TABLE 15—RATIO OF WAGE EARNERS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES, 1899-1929, TO TOTAL URBAN POPULATION, 1900-1930

URBAN POPULATION <sup>1</sup>		WAGE EARNERS IN MANUFACTURES (AVERAGE NUMBER EMPLOYED DURING YEAR) <sup>2</sup>		RATIO OF WAGE EARNERS TO 100 OF URBAN POPULATION
Region and Year	Number (in thousands)	Region and Year	Number (in thousands)	
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>		<b>SOUTHEAST</b>		
1900.....	2,761	1899.....	554	20.1
1910.....	4,052	1909.....	845	20.9
1920.....	5,455	1919.....	1,032	18.9
1930.....	7,617	1929.....	1,165	15.3
<b>SOUTHWEST</b>		<b>SOUTHWEST</b>		
1900.....	626	1899.....	47	7.5
1910.....	1,368	1909.....	94	6.9
1920.....	2,235	1919.....	151	6.8
1930.....	3,468	1929.....	178	5.1
<b>UNITED STATES</b>		<b>UNITED STATES</b>		
1900.....	30,797	1899.....	4,713	15.3
1910.....	42,623	1909.....	6,615	15.5
1920.....	54,305	1919.....	9,000	16.6
1930.....	68,955	1929.....	8,808	12.8

<sup>1</sup> Figures are taken from Table 1.

<sup>2</sup> United States Census, 1930, *Manufactures*, Vol. VIII, 1920, pp. 542-543, *Manufactures*, VIII, pp. 172-173.

older districts to the new are occurring. McKenzie has studied 33 major industrial areas based upon the counties in which the central industrial cities of the areas are located and several counties adjacent thereto. All of the areas are in the Northeast and the Middle States, except four that are in the Far West. He finds that of the 33 areas, 24 show fewer wage earners engaged in manufactures in 1929 than in 1919; he also finds that the rates of decline in 16 are twice as great as the national rate of decline of 2.1 per cent and that the declines in 10 districts are 10 per cent or more. He concludes that 'the forces that have made for population increase in these

concentrated territories during the last decade have been other than manufacturing."<sup>1</sup>

Both the Southeast and the Southwest have apparently profited by recent declines in the older industrial districts of the Northeast and the Middle States. McKenzie's study offers some proof in support of this point. He studied industrial concentration in 29 counties in the Southeast, including West Virginia, and four counties in the Southwest. These 33 counties represent the leading Southern manufacturing areas.<sup>2</sup> He discovered that of the 29 counties in the Southeast 21 showed increases in factory wage earners from 1919 to 1929 ranging from 0.7 per cent in Bibb County, Georgia, to 86.0 per cent in Gaston County, North Carolina, the rates of increase on the average being rather high; he also discovered that of four counties in the Southwest, all of which were in Texas, three showed increases of from 36.5 to 68.2 per cent. But 'even in those districts in which the factory population made substantial gains,' McKenzie observes, 'the factory population can only partially account for the high rates of increase in the total population, as the ratio of wage earners to total population is, in most instances, relatively low.'<sup>3</sup>

While manufacturing only partially accounts for recent urban concentration in the South, it almost wholly accounts for the rise and growth of particular cities. The cities of the Old South were exclusively commercial; they were centers of surrounding agricultural territories; they were largely the products of agrarianism. But with the rise of industrialism, new types of cities appeared. Since the turn of the century industrial cities have emerged; their origin and development are explained almost altogether on industrial grounds. Chief among such cities are Birmingham, Durham, Winston-Salem, Greenville, Gastonia, and other smaller places. These cities have little or no connection with the agrarian South; they are manufacturing centers—industrial cities similar to scores of industrial cities in the Northeast and in the Middle States. They have swelled the tides of urban growth in the Southeast and owe their present positions not to the commercial but to the industrial functions that they perform.

Even though factory wage earners in the Southeast during

<sup>1</sup> R. D. McKenzie, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-57.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 58.

the past two decades and in the Southwest during the last decade have increased much less rapidly than urban population, they have greatly increased in absolute numbers in each region. From 1899 to 1929, they increased in the Southeast 110.2 per cent and in the Southwest 278.7 per cent. These increases have contributed greatly to urban growth since the coming of industry to the South has caused a shift of population from agriculture to manufacturing and since manufacturing always tends

TABLE 16—GAINFUL WORKERS 10 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER BY GENERAL DIVISIONS OF OCCUPATIONS IN THE SOUTHEAST AND THE UNITED STATES IN 1910 AND 1930

DIVISIONS OF OCCUPATIONS	1930 <sup>1</sup>		1910 <sup>2</sup>	
	Total	Per cent of total	Total	Per cent of total
<b>SOUTHEAST</b>	9,690,159	100.0	8,910,348	99.8
Agriculture	4,213,121	43.5	5,380,216	60.3
Forestry and fishing	81,862	.8	74,013	.8
Extraction of minerals	148,174	1.5	96,897	1.1
Manufacturing and				
Mechanical industries	1,895,656	19.6	1,259,494	14.1
Transportation and				
Communication	589,960	6.1	371,647	4.2
Trade	814,475	8.4	470,590	5.3
Public service (not classified elsewhere)	127,344	1.3	65,416	.7
Professional service	438,009	4.5	226,683	2.5
Domestic and personal service	1,015,582	10.5	810,259	9.1
Clerical occupations	365,976	3.8	155,133	1.7
<b>UNITED STATES</b>	48,829,920	100.0	38,167,336	100.0
Agriculture	10,471,998	21.4	12,388,309	32.5
Forestry and fishing	250,469	.5	241,806	.6
Extraction of minerals	984,323	2.0	965,169	2.5
Manufacturing and				
Mechanical industries	14,110,652	28.9	10,656,445	27.9
Transportation and				
Communication	3,843,147	7.9	2,665,269	7.0
Trade	6,081,467	12.5	3,633,265	9.5
Public service (not classified elsewhere)	856,205	1.8	431,442	1.1
Professional service	3,253,884	6.7	1,711,275	4.5
Domestic and personal service	4,952,451	10.1	3,755,798	9.8
Clerical occupations	4,025,324	8.2	1,718,468	4.5

<sup>1</sup> United States Census, 1930, *Population*, Vol. IV; compiled from Tables 6 and 7, pp. 19-20.

<sup>2</sup> United States Census, 1910, *Population*, Vol. IV; compiled from Table 10, pp. 44-45.

to concentrate itself in urban centers of greater or lesser magnitudes. The size of this shift from agriculture to manufacturing may be seen in Table 16.

The urbanization of the South is due not only to the development of manufacturing but also to the development of commerce. While manufacturing has contributed greatly to the increase in urban population, especially in earlier periods and in case of particular cities, the chief explanation of urbanization probably lies in the realms of trade. Whereas the proportion of the gainfully employed population engaged in manufacturing in all of the cities of 250,000 or more inhabitants in the United States decreased from 1920 to 1930, the proportion engaged in trade increased. In a majority of the cities the gains in trade were striking.<sup>1</sup> Seven of these cities with 250,000 or more—New Orleans, Louisville, Atlanta, Dallas, Houston, Birmingham, and Memphis—were in the South.

That commerce has influenced the development of Southern cities is not very difficult to prove. Since population is shifting from 'the field work' in connection with acquiring raw materials to 'center activities' in connection with the processing of the materials and with services required by rising standards of living, figures indicating occupational shifts to trade are pertinent. Trade in the Southeast as well as in the United States is attracting an increasing proportion of the gainfully employed population. As Table 16 shows, while 5.3 per cent of those gainfully employed in the Southeast in 1910 were engaged in trade, 8.4 per cent were engaged in trade in 1930. The rate of shift is slightly greater in the Southeast than in the United States although the latter has a much higher proportion of its gainfully employed population in trade in each of the years than the former. Moreover, while the number engaged in trade increased 73.1 per cent in the Southeast and 87.2 per cent in the United States from 1910 to 1930, urban population in the former increased 88.0 per cent and in the latter 63.0 per cent. Consequently, urban population increased more rapidly in the Southeast and less rapidly in the United States than the number of persons gainfully employed in trade.

Clerical occupations, like trade, are urban occupations. Many of these occupations are connected with the performance of professional services, but most of them arise out of the activities of commerce. Since this is the case, the increase in the number

<sup>1</sup> R. D. McKenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

of those gainfully employed in these occupations has a direct bearing on urban growth. The proportion of persons gainfully engaged in clerical occupations in the Southeast increased from 1.7 per cent of the total in 1910 to 3.8 per cent in 1930. In the United States the proportion increased during the same period from 4.5 per cent to 8.2 per cent. The total number in clerical occupations in the Southeast increased 135.9 per cent from 1910 to 1930 and in the United States 134.2 per cent. The number of persons gainfully employed in clerical occupations in the Southeast, therefore, increased somewhat less than twice as fast as its urban population. The number in the United States increased more than twice as fast as its urban population.

But the increase in the number of persons gainfully employed in trade and in clerical occupations alone does not indicate the full influence of commercial activities on urban development. Cities, whether in the South or elsewhere, have always functioned as market places, distributing points and financial centers. The concentration of wholesaling, finance and retailing in urban communities has proceeded at a rapidly increasing rate in recent years. The total value of wholesale business done in the Southeast in 1929 was \$6,950,418,000 of which \$3,221,333,000, or 46.3 per cent, is credited to the 13 cities of 100,000 or more.<sup>1</sup> The total value of wholesale business in the Southwest in the same year was \$3,729,017,000 of which \$2,125,716,000, or 57.0 per cent, was done in the seven cities of 100,000 or more. The wholesale business of the Southeast and Southwest combined amounted to \$10,679,425,000 of which \$5,347,049,000, or 50.1 per cent, was done in the 20 cities of 100,000 or more.

Retailing is likewise concentrated in the larger cities. Total net sales of retail business in the Southeast in 1929 were \$5,755,848,000 of which \$1,338,616,000, or 23.3 per cent, was confined to the 13 cities of 100,000 or more.<sup>2</sup> Net sales in the Southwest in the same year amounted to \$3,156,427,000 of which \$848,986,000, or 26.9 per cent, was confined to the seven cities of 100,000 or more. Of the total retail business of the Southeast and the Southwest combined, 24.5 per cent was done in the 20 cities of 100,000 or more. Further calculations of a

<sup>1</sup> United States Census, 1930, *Abstract of the Fifteenth Census of the United States*; Calculations on wholesale business were made from Tables 3 and 5, pp. 916-918.

<sup>2</sup> United States Census, 1930, *Abstract of the Fifteenth Census of the United States*; Calculations concerning retail business were made from Table 2, p. 869, and Table 7, pp. 878-892.



similar nature would probably reveal that almost three-fourths of the total retail business of both regions is done in cities of 10,000 or more. That such a statement is not altogether unreasonable is shown by McKenzie's study of retail business in cities of this size throughout the United States.<sup>1</sup> McKenzie found that while in 1930 cities of 10,000 or more in the United States had only 48 per cent of the total population, they did 70 per cent of the total retail business.

Just as wholesaling and retailing have become concentrated in larger cities so also has finance. Banks have always been urban institutions. Ever since the World War the banking function has more and more shifted from small towns and villages to the larger centers of population. McKenzie found that 80 per cent of bank suspensions from 1921 to 1930 occurred in places of less than 2,500 people.<sup>2</sup> Of the 100 largest banks in the United States in 1930, three were in the Southeast and three in the Southwest.<sup>3</sup> The six cities in which these banks were located are as follows: Atlanta, Dallas, New Orleans, Oklahoma City, Savannah, and Tulsa. All of these cities represent metropolitan districts with 100,000 or more inhabitants in 1930.

Moreover, the urbanization of the South is due to the increased number of persons engaged in service occupations. Table 16, which has been presented earlier, shows the number of gainful workers 10 years of age and over, who were employed in these service occupations in the Southeast and in the United States in 1910 and 1930. In 1910 there were 1,102,358 persons employed in the Southeast in the three groups of public service, professional service not classified elsewhere, and domestic and personal service. By 1930 the number had increased to 1,580,935 persons, or a gain of 43.4 per cent during the 20 year period. In 1910 these three service groups constituted 12.3 per cent of the total number gainfully employed in the Southeast, whereas in 1930 they constituted 16.3 per cent of the total number.

The increase in these three groups in the United States from 1910 to 1930 is 53.6 per cent, a percentage of increase appreciably higher than that of the Southeast. Moreover, the proportion of the total gainful workers in the United States engaged in these three groups is appreciably larger than in the South-

<sup>1</sup> R. D. McKenzie. *op. cit.*, pp. 61-62.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 117.

east. While the three groups in 1910 constituted 15.4 per cent of the total persons gainfully employed in the United States, in 1930 they constituted 18.6 per cent. The extent to which these services are concentrated in urban localities in the South is indicated by the proportion of persons performing such services in cities of 100,000 or more. Whereas the 13 cities of 100,000 or more in the Southeast in 1930 contained 10.1 per cent of the total population, they accounted for 22.1 per cent of the total number of persons employed in these three service groups. Relatively the same percentage would probably apply to the Southwest. Consequently it may be concluded that public, professional, and personal services have become concentrated in fewer centers in the South just as commercial functions have become concentrated in fewer centers.

Increased concentration of population in the cities of the South has also come about because of increased development of resort areas and other physical attractions in the Southern region. The growth of wealth and income in the United States together with improvements in travel facilities has caused shifts of wealth from places where it is produced to places where health and recreation may adequately be obtained. Population, therefore, has turned more and more to areas superior in leisure-time advantages. The sections of the country that offer the greater attractions in this respect readily draw these people. The South offers unique opportunities to the leisure classes. Consequently, Southern cities, particularly those in Florida, have grown with great rapidity.

